

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

SHANTUBHAI SHAH,)	Civil No.: 3:17-cv-00226-JE
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	ORDER
v.)	
)	
MEIER ENTERPRISES, INC., a)	
Washington Corporation; PAUL GIEVER,)	
CEO/President; STEVEN ANDERSON, an)	
Individual; BOBBI KEEN, an Individual;)	
MEIER ENTERPRISES OFFICERS,)	
Individuals; MEIER ENTERPRISES)	
DIRECTORS, Individuals; MEIER)	
ENTERPRISES EMPLOYEE OWNERS,)	
Individuals;)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

JELDERKS, Magistrate Judge:

Pro se Plaintiff Shah brings this action against Defendants Meier Enterprises, Inc. (“Meier”); and individuals Paul Giever, Steven Anderson, Bobbi Keen, alleging age and race and national origin discrimination under federal and Washington state laws, whistle blower retaliation under Oregon and Washington state laws and common law retaliatory wrongful discharge.

On January 5, 2018, Defendants filed a motion pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 56(d), seeking a continuance of their deadline to respond to Plaintiff’s Amended Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. #79). On January 10, 2018, full consent by all parties to jurisdiction by a U.S.

Magistrate Judge was obtained. Plaintiff filed his Response to the Rule 56(d) motion on January 18, 2018 (Dkt. #94). On January 22, 2018, after reviewing Defendants' Motion and Plaintiff's Response, this Court entered an Opinion and Order granting Defendants' Motion (Dkt. #92). On January 31, 2018, Plaintiff filed a document titled "Plaintiff's Objection to Court's Opinion and Order for Defendants' Motion to Continue" (Dkt. #96). Defendants' filed their Response to Plaintiff's Objections on February 14, 2018 (Dkt. #99).

The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's submission and Defendants' Response. It appears from the wording of Defendants' Response that it was assumed that the Objection would be reviewed by a District Judge. However, because this case now has full consents to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction, a District Judge will no longer be involved with the proceedings and all matters at the trial court level will be resolved by this Magistrate Judge by opinion and order.

Accordingly, I will treat Plaintiff's Objections as a Motion for Reconsideration and, for the reasons set out in my previous Opinion and Order, deny the motion.

Conclusion

Plaintiff's Objections (Dkt. #96), which are considered by this Court as a Motion for Reconsideration, are DENIED.

DATED this 20th day of February, 2018.

/s/ John Jelderks
John Jelderks
U.S. Magistrate Judge